

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/609,362	ALAM, AKM KAMRUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan A. Vu	2193	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A. Vu. (3) _____

(2) Arthur Samodovitz. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 9/26-9/28/07.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: the Applicant's representative was presented with the Examiner's suggestion as to readjust the semantic layout and phraseology of the claimed steps to put forth a simple and clear flow of action by which the first invoked object identifies another program object and supplies thereto the prerequisite parameters for said other object invocation so that other object installs its respective application. Also suggested and agreed upon was the reciting of one object invoking another object in supporting respective applications for a server. As agreed upon the changes would put the case in condition for allowance..